



---

## 2009 Decisions

Opinions of the United  
States Court of Appeals  
for the Third Circuit

4-2-2009

# Felicia Pearson v. Comm Social Security

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit\\_2009](https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2009)

---

### Recommended Citation

"Felicia Pearson v. Comm Social Security" (2009). *2009 Decisions*. 1591.  
[https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit\\_2009/1591](https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2009/1591)

This decision is brought to you for free and open access by the Opinions of the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit at Villanova University Charles Widger School of Law Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in 2009 Decisions by an authorized administrator of Villanova University Charles Widger School of Law Digital Repository.

NOT PRECEDENTIAL

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

---

No. 08-3760

---

FELICIA PEARSON,  
Appellant  
v.

COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY

---

APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY  
(D.C. Civ. No. 2-07-cv-05581)  
District Judge: Honorable William J. Martini

---

Submitted Under Third Circuit L.A.R. 34.1(a)  
March 3, 2009  
Before: BARRY, WEIS and ROTH, Circuit Judges  
(Filed: April 2, 2009)

---

OPINION

---

WEIS, Circuit Judge.

The claimant in this case filed an application for disability payments in 2004. At that time, she had impaired vision. She subsequently underwent operations to remove cataracts from both eyes and now has average vision. She also contends that she suffers from asthma, various psychiatric conditions, and malnutrition.

The ALJ determined that claimant does not suffer from a combination of impairments that qualify as “severe” under the Social Security Act and, consequently, that she was not disabled pursuant to 20 C.F.R. § 416.920(c). On appeal, the District Court held that the ALJ’s conclusion is supported by substantial evidence and affirmed the denial of benefits.

After reviewing this case, we conclude that claimant has not presented any reversible error. Substantial evidence supports the ALJ’s determination that claimant did not demonstrate “something beyond ‘a slight abnormality or a combination of slight abnormalities which would have no more than a minimal effect on an individual’s ability to work.’” McCrea v. Comm’r of Soc. Sec., 370 F.3d 357, 360 (3d Cir. 2004) (quoting SSR 85-28, 1985 WL 56856, at \*3). Accordingly, we will affirm the Order of the District Court. See id. at 360-61 (a determination that a disability claimant’s impairments are not “severe” “is to be upheld if supported by substantial evidence on the record as a whole”).